THEOLOGY

VOL. LIII JULY, 1950 No. 361

Editorial

"LET us remain invincibly sure", wrote Lord Morley in his *Recollections*, "that Progress stands for a working belief that the modern world will never consent to do without." We cannot afford to stone his memory. Who of us would not be embarrassed if all his *obiter dicta* on the subject of progress were assembled, and he were asked to reconcile them or even to explain exactly what any of them meant. We are told *ad nauseam* that the bitter experiences of the past fifty years have turned men's minds from confident belief in progress to doubt and despair of it. But just what was it that we were supposed, or supposed ourselves, to believe, and can no longer? And is there any vital Christian interest in the answer to this question? After all, the Christian has never been called upon to say in his creed, "I believe in progress", nor on the other hand to renounce progressivism and all its works.

The fact is that the word "progress", quite apart from the emotional effects with which it has become charged, stands now for a tangle of heterogeneous notions. We have to thank Professor John Baillie for disentangling them in his new book, *The Belief in Progress* (Oxford University Press, 10s. 6d.). He begins by inquiring what kinds of progress can be empirically observed in past history, and shows that there is certainly discernible "progress in such an understanding by man of his physical environment as enables him at the same time better to adjust himself to it and better to manipulate it for the satisfaction of his own bodily needs". There has also been a growth in knowledge which serves other than utilitarian ends —*e.g.*, mathematical and historical. But in man's spiritual life, which embraces morality and æsthetics as well as religion, no such continual advance can be discerned.

But there is a belief in progress which is not based on empirical observation and which extends its confidence into the future. Dr Baillie traces the precedents for this belief in antiquity, and then unravels the factors which led to its emergence as a full-blown philosophy of history in the nineteenth century and as a substitute religion. Here he distinguishes the utopian expectations which were characteristic of the French *philosophes*, the idea of an immanent principle of development inherent in history which was worked out by the German idealists, and the theory of biological evolution which is associated with the name of Darwin. There was no necessary connexion or coherence between those three elements in the popular belief in progress into which they were fused and which

became an axiom of the modern mind. Neither singly nor together are they able to sustain the hope which they have been called upon to buttress. The generality of men may still cherish the comforting belief, but the most thoughtful have already perceived the fallacies in it and it is not likely to retain its hold for long on the popular mind.

"And this", Dr Baillie justly observes, "is a prospect in which none can be so insensitive or hard-hearted as to rejoice; a situation the possible disastrous consequences of which it is difficult to overestimate. For what, after all, is left for modern man to believe in, if he can no longer believe that the future is likely to be better than the past, or that his children's children are likely to inhabit a world less full of wrong than he himself has had to live in? We have all of us, we children of the modern West, nourished this illusion in our breasts, if illusion it be; and we are all involved together in the tragedy of its fading."

In his concluding chapter, which is modestly entitled "Towards a Conclusion", Dr Baillie is therefore led to ask whether or no the Christian faith has a message of hope for the terrestrial life of mankind, as well as the assurance of a transcendent goal of history. It cannot be said that the Christian tradition as a whole offers an affirmative answer, but if the implications of the New Testament Gospel are reviewed it will be found that the promises of God and the victory of Christ warrant the hope not only of the conversion of individuals but of an increasing transformation of the whole life of society. Recent theological work on the cosmic aspect of Christ's redeeming work and on the present realization of the eschatological hope is shown to point in this direction. Enough has perhaps been said to indicate that this book touches the nerve of much of our present-day bewilderment, and will repay careful study.

Vocation to the Ministry

THE decision of the Archbishops and Bishops to ask the whole Church in the provinces of Canterbury and York to observe Trinity Sunday as a day of prayer and almsgiving for the training of men for the ministry has been both welcomed and criticized. It has been welcomed as a means of putting before the congregations of our churches the whole question of Christian Vocation leading on to the particular vocation to ordination. It has been criticized on the grounds that provision is already made for this in the Ember seasons and that it is adding yet another special Sunday—and on a day when the doctrine of the Trinity should be proclaimed.

Trinity Sunday has been chosen for the obvious reason that on that day an Ordination Service is held in every cathedral of our communion, and the fact that it has been thought necessary to focus our prayers and thoughts on this one day is the measure of our failure to use widely or adequately the Ember Days as provided for in the Prayer Book. That there is a need for such a focusing is

self-evident. If positive steps are to be taken to deal with the shortage of ordination candidates, the need must be placed squarely before our congregations within the setting of Vocation as the Christian calling. It must be true that for a long time the Church has failed to do this. Only too easily have we sat back and expected the ministry to be there—provided without effort, either in prayer or teaching or financially. If such a time existed it has passed long ago, and now we find ourselves facing a difficult yet rather thrilling task —that of going out in God's name and deliberately calling men to serve in the ministry of His Church.

Some of the hesitancy to call men in the past can be ascribed to a genuine belief that *only* "an inward sense of call" was a real vocation. If God wants men, it has been argued, He will call them by the direct action of His Holy Spirit, and to suggest that His Church should actively set out to find men was almost blasphemous. It is, of course, true that the Holy Spirit working within the heart and mind of an individual makes him conscious of a call, but I wonder in fact how often this really happens? The large majority of those at present within the ministry would, on tracing back their own sense of call, trace it eventually to some source outside themselves—a parent, a schoolmaster, a parish priest, a friend, or even an unknown preacher who sowed the first seed. The call of the first disciples at any rate came directly from without, and while there are some who go through a Damascus Road experience, still God works through human agencies and through other men His call to the ministry is made.

So on Trinity Sunday the Church was asked to make this call. I hope that it was not made in any defeatist way. This is not the call of a failing ministry to try to rally men to its ranks. True, the numbers in its active service are fewer by some thousands than, *e.g.*, in 1914; true too that the population of this country has increased by some millions, and that the existing staff of the Church is overworked and overburdened, but men are coming forward and it is not too much to claim that some of the best in each generation continue to offer themselves. The call to the ministry will be seen most clearly against the background of the opportunities being offered to the Church in these exciting days and the need of man-power to meet these opportunities.

Many figures have been given in recent years and I do not propose to repeat them. Suffice it to say that the annual replacement need of the Church is 600 and that for the next few years it does not seem that more than 400 per annum will be ordained. Something can be done to meet the present situation by a wiser use of existing manpower. It is true that in many parts of the country there is an overlapping in the parochial system, particularly in smaller towns, which is unwarrantable in view of the needs of the large industrial areas. Something can be done under the Pastoral Reorganization Measure to rectify this, though it must be hoped that this will not be done at the expense of the country districts.

Suggestions are being made that a solution to the present difficulty

is to be found in the ordination of men—*e.g.*, barristers, solicitors, businessmen, etc.—who would continue in their occupations and minister as part-time men at week-ends. This might help a little in relieving the parish priest of the rush which Sunday usually is for him, but it goes nowhere near the real heart of the problem. There can be no solution apart from the provision of sufficient full-time priests. It is the pastoral ministry of the Church which is so lacking to-day. Generally the Sacraments are being administered, the worship of the Church is being carried on faithfully, but the visitation of the parish with its opportunities in evangelism and pastoral care has very largely broken down. There is growing up in some parts of the country a generation which has never seen the "parson" about in the parish and has no idea for what he exists. Only the adequate staffing of the parishes with full-time priests can supply a real answer.

The object of the Trinity Sunday appeal was not only to place Vocation in the forefront of the congregations, but also to ask them through the ordinary collections to provide the money needed each year for the training of the recommended candidates. It is quite impossible to say how much will be needed annually for this purpose, but it is clear that if the policy is to be continued of ensuring a candidate that money will be found a large sum must be found each year. Much needs to be done to ensure that all sources of financial help are being used, including a measure of self-help on the part of each candidate, but it would be wrong if there was a return to what not infrequently happened before the war when suitable candidates were prevented from going forward because no money could be found to train them. The Church surely has a moral obligation after she has recommended a man as suitable for training to ensure that finance does not stand in the way.

The provision of money for training, however, is but the beginning of the problem, and there are those who would question the integrity of a Church which seeks to recruit men and yet is unable to pay them adequately when they have been ordained. Fortunately there is a growing conscience about this in the Church and the lay-members are realizing their responsibilities. Much needs to be done, but in my own diocese there is now a minimum scale of £500 p.a. for incumbents and £550 p.a. for those with parishes of over 5,000 in population. Unfortunately it is true that rising costs of living have offset the effectiveness of much augmentation. For assistant curates we have a scale of £300 for unmarried men and £350 with free house for married men. Even with the efforts which are being made it is doubtful if the old conception of the Church of England parson can be maintained. A number of possibilities suggest themselves as means of dealing with the problem. It may be that the Church must go to the State with the question, "Do you want to continue the Ministry of the Church? If so, some means of relief in taxation must be found." An obvious start would be the Easter Offering and additional expenses of office might be allowed. That might savour too much of alignment with the State.

Alternatively the suggestion made by a number of headmasters

must be tried. They would complain that our call to ordination is being put on too low a level and that until a challenge of celibacy and poverty, perhaps for a limited period, say ten years, is put there will not be the response. Certainly it would seem clear that the Church ought to expect its ordinands to accept a period after ordination when marriage would not be allowed or at least men should be given an opportunity to agree not to marry. It would be a severe loss to the Church life of this land if celibacy became a general rule, but it is possible that many men would accept it for a period and be ready to live to much simpler standards. Certainly much can be done to make parsonage houses more manageable and reduce the very heavy overhead charges on the income of a living.

The suggestion that a way round the problem is to see that men ordained in the future have some other qualification by which they can augment their income might ease the financial problem, but only if there were a very large number of such men would it solve the man-power problem. The fact still remains that the problem before the Church is the pastoral ministry in the parishes, and unless priests in the future have time to pray, to visit, and to teach, the problem of the evangelization of England will remain as acute as it is now.

There can be no easy solution to all these problems. Any such solution which created an unnatural division of any kind within the ministry itself would need to be examined very carefully before it was adopted, for the inherent dangers of any such division are obvious from history and from a practical point of view to-day. The only clear way at present is in an adequate supply of men and in an adequate fund of money to train men and to pay them after ordination. It is possible that during the training period and in the ministry itself economic factors will force us to accept simpler ways of living. What is clear is that there exists a need to put the claims of ordination into the minds of boys and their advisers. In too many schools, some public boarding schools and many grammar and secondary schools, it is no longer on the map at all when a boy is thinking about his future. If the appeal to be made each year on Trinity Sunday does nothing more than to restore ordination as one of the possibilities a boy considers, it will have done much. If it brings home afresh to the minds of all Christians the true meaning of vocation, the effort will not have been in vain.

JOHN PHILLIPS.

Parliamentary Grants for New Churches

THE discussions now going on about the relations of Church and State and about ecclesiastical finance give a new interest to the last occasion when the State made a substantial grant to the Church. In 1818 Parliament voted £1,000,000 and in 1824 £500,000 for church building. Both grants met with opposition, especially in the Commons, and it was stated by some at the time and assumed by many

since that the Tory government, afraid of growing industrial distress, was using a largely torpid Church as a buttress against revolution. The purpose of this article is to sketch the course of events, to discover who took the initiative in inducing the government to act, and to question the assumption that political prudence was the sole motive of those members of Parliament who supported these measures. The conflicts of Church and State are memorable because they test the courage of the Church; those occasions when Church and State work together are suspect. It is assumed that a corrupt bargain has been arranged. When the Parliament concerned was the unreformed Parliament and the Church was still awaiting the zeal of the Evangelicals, the Tractarians and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the verdict of guilty is given without more ado.

During the eighteenth century the building of a new parish church required an Act of Parliament, since it involved the setting up of a new civil parish as well. Even to build a chapel of ease meant a number of legal formalities, owing to the supposed threat to the rights of existing parishes, tithe owners, and patrons. In 1800 William Wilberforce introduced a Bill designed to encourage private persons to construct churches by granting the advowsons to those who subscribed, but this was opposed by the bishops, who feared that it would lead to more unlicensed proprietary chapels. But, despite the legal difficulties, many churches were erected in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and their architectural merits have recently been enthusiastically described by Mr Marcus Whiffen (*Stuart and Georgian Churches*). In 1710 Parliament had encouraged a comprehensive scheme for building fifty new churches in London and Westminster, though only eleven were actually built. The immense increase in population at the end of the century and the difficulties of church building in war-time would have overwhelmed any church, even a church more capable of action than the Church of England. Apologists like Milman made both these points, blamed Parliament for the crippling restrictions placed on building churches and, like some of the speakers in the Commons, noted the mixture of motives in the building of dissenting chapels. "Though not actually in the market with Mexican and Columbian scrip, Tabernacle bonds are with many as good security and bear as high a premium as any other medium of exchange" (*Quarterly Review*, 1824). But, to whatever efforts or difficulties or excuses the apologist might point, it was clear in the years before Waterloo that a large number of churches must be built immediately.

Before the end of the war churchmen were beginning to press the State to build churches. Wilberforce had failed in 1800 and thereafter it was the High Church party which took the lead, a lead which suggests that for once M. Halévy needs correction when he refers to the "slumber" and "practical insignificance" of this party (*England in 1815*, 1949 ed., p. 477). An approach was made to Perceval shortly before his assassination, and again in 1815 a Subscription was sent to the Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool. The subscribers pointed out that in "fifty parishes in or near the capital

there are more than a million of inhabitants and the churches are not capable of containing one-tenth part of that multitude and even those places are chiefly calculated for the higher classes of society" [because of pew rents]. Parliament alone could remedy this, "and we conceive it to be one of its chief duties to provide places of worship for members of the established Religion". The High Church party was receiving the co-operation of the Evangelicals, for William Wilberforce and John Thornton signed with the High Churchmen James Allan Park, John Bowdler, Joshua Watson, and many others. The government replied that the financial difficulties of the country prevented it from giving any help at the moment, but this did not discourage the subscribers. On May 23, 1817, George Bramwell summoned a meeting of the signatories to consider this reply and a committee was appointed. This met three days later and included, in addition to Bowdler and Bramwell, Lord Kenyon, George Gipps, M.P., William Davis, and several other laymen. It was decided to call a general meeting at which it should be proposed "that it is expedient to form a Society for promoting public Worship by obtaining additional Church Room for the middle and lower classes" and that "no money be advanced without the consent of the ordinary Patron and Incumbent". On June 7 these resolutions were put to a general meeting and it was determined to send a deputation to Lord Liverpool to discover whether he was favourable to the founding of a society. On June 9 the deputation met for consultation, called on Lord Liverpool on the 11th, and reported to a general meeting on the 21st. Sir Thomas Acland was spokesman for the deputation. Lord Liverpool, he said, "countenanced the Society so long as the heads of the Church gave their consent". He urged them to call on the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. The deputation told Lord Liverpool that "it was of the greatest importance that the Society should not interfere with any more comprehensive Plans which the Government might have in Contemplation; to which Lord Liverpool replied that he thought the proposed Society if properly constituted would on the contrary rather promote the View of Government on that Subject and prepare the Way to the measures which they, the Government, had certainly at heart and which they were compelled to defer until the Situation of the Country would allow of their being carried into Effect". The deputation then waited on the Archbishop, Manners-Sutton. He approved the founding of the Society and "derived the greater satisfaction because without this he feared that much of the good now being shewn by the National Society would produce harm instead of good. He would aid in every way the proposed Society, hoping at the same time that it would not be the cause of inducing any Slackness in Government, for he was satisfied that Parliament alone could remedy the magnitude of the evil." The Bishop of London was away from home, but wrote to William Davis, who was now acting as secretary, giving his approval. The Society was finally constituted on February 6, 1818, under the patronage of the Duke of York, with the Archbishop in the chair, in the presence of ninety leading

churchmen, more than half lay, including William Wilberforce and Robert Peel.

These details of the creation of the Church Building Society, which can be found in its first MS minute book, are remarkable for several reasons. They show the initiative coming from a small group of laymen within the Church, but acting with the willing support of the leaders of Church and State. The Prime Minister was ready to give all assistance, but only when he was sure that the leading bishops were in agreement. The drive and vigour of the inner lay group of Bowdler, Bramwell, Davis, and Joshua Watson are admirable. Throughout the last six months of 1817 they met every week and as many as eight times in July. In October the Lord Chancellor questioned the legality of the Society on the grounds that it was infringing the rights of patrons and incumbents, but Bramwell in a long reply stood his ground, concluding by assuring the Lord Chancellor himself that its "legality cannot be doubted". It was not until November 7 that the name of a clergyman, Mr Yates, appeared at a weekly meeting. The arrangements for the inaugural meeting of February 6 were made entirely by the lay group, Joshua Watson keeping the Archbishop informed of what was required. The conventional picture of a sleeping Church being used by astute politicians as an anti-Jacobin scarecrow must be modified.

The State at last began to act. On March 16, 1818, the House of Commons went into committee to consider the reference in the Regent's Speech to new churches. The Chancellor of the Exchequer referred to the previous attempts at church building, mentioned the difficulties caused by the growth in population and the war, and stressed the grants which Parliament had already made "to promote the comforts of the clergy, and to confer on the public the benefit of a resident, a respectable and a moderately endowed ministry". He then gave statistical evidence for the lack of churches. He quoted with approval from a pamphlet by Mr. Yates, whom we have met already. "He might instance (as Mr Yates has most forcibly done) the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and the rights [*sic;* Hansard has slipped] of baptism, burial, and marriage. How was it possible for those ordinances to be celebrated in the solemn and impressive manner which their services and important nature required in the crowd and hurry unavoidably attending their perpetual and almost ceaseless repetition in such a crowded population? . . . He might indeed almost say that the reformation for which he pleaded was not less important to the security of property and the civil order of society than to the higher considerations of religion and morality." He went on to stress that this was not an attack on dissenters "or the slightest infringement of the liberty of conscience they so happily enjoyed", but he believed that "many had forsaken the Church because it had shut its doors upon them". In conclusion he mentioned "a most excellent society lately formed", but perhaps naturally he did not say that those who formed that society were mainly responsible for the government's action. The Chancellor's reference

to the Church shutting its doors is perfectly just; when the average industrial worker says to-day that "the church is not for the likes of him" he is expressing the alienation which began at the industrial revolution. During the subsequent stages of the Bill the only opposition came in the Commons from Sir Charles Monck, who observed "that in travelling over England he believed that it would be found that where there were most churches the people were far from being the most exemplary in their behaviour", and in the Lords from Lord Holland, who thought that the suspension of a few deans and canons would provide enough money. Lord Liverpool and the Archbishop both spoke in favour of the grant, and £1,000,000 was voted.

The grant was administered by a commission; its committee met for the first time on July 31 at Lambeth, and consisted of Lord Grenville, the Speaker, Wollaston, Wordsworth, Mant, Archdeacon Pott, and Joshua Watson—the last five being all churchmen who had been previously in touch with each other about church building. At each stage the Church was taking the initiative and ensuring that the State's assistance was used in the most effective way. Joshua Watson found that his work for the commission was so engrossing that he moved to a house in Westminster in 1822 in order to be on the spot.

The granting of a further £500,000 in 1824 met with much opposition from the Radical critics of the weakening Tory administration. The Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced the motion on April 9. He began by expressing his surprise that there was any opposition. "But of all the objections that it was possible to anticipate he did confess that he was not prepared for the objection, that to accede to a grant for facilitating the religious intercourse of the professors of the church of England was something almost amounting to blasphemy. No established church could be maintained otherwise than at public expense." He mentioned the recent grants which Parliament had made to Roman Catholics in Ireland and Presbyterians in Scotland. He gave Parliament the credit which, as we have seen, was due to others when he said: "In fact, the example set by Parliament had excited the zeal and the emulation of the professors of the established church; and already more than £200,000 had been subscribed for building places of worship, and further subscriptions might be expected." He concluded by stressing the need for new churches. At Nottingham the free seats were actually taken by storm, and in the "wilder parts of the country" such as Ringwood in Hampshire a material change had taken place in the religious demeanour of the inhabitants since the new church had been erected. "The great body of the people had hitherto consisted of smugglers and poachers; the Sabbath was considered rather as a carnival than a day set apart for religious devotion. A great moral change had since been effected." The debate was continued by Hobhouse, the friend of Byron, in a bitter attack. Robert Peel and Dr Lushington replied. An even more critical speech was made by Joseph Hume, the Radical M.P. for Aberdeen. "Before they thought

of building churches with this £500,000 he would recommend them to examine the income of the bishopric of Durham. . . ." He suggested that more care was needed in the selection of ordination candidates. "They found many individuals who having run a gay life in the army, navy, or marines were now entered into holy orders." At every stage Hobhouse and Hume led the opposition. The interests of the dissenters were mentioned by a number of speakers. George Banks urged that care should be taken not to widen the gulf between church and chapel. "It certainly ought to be a main object with the government to provide for the union of sexes (sects) [laughter]. That union had been an object much attended to in Ireland. It was a union that it was of the greatest consequence to keep up [renewed laughter]. He apprehended from the laughter in which hon. gentlemen indulged that he had inadvertently committed some verbal inaccuracy." Mr Gordon, on the other hand, voiced the eighteenth-century point of view. "This was a canting and hypocritical age and it was because he saw less of that cant and hypocrisy in the established church than among evangelical missionaries that he was anxious to support the church by voting for the resolution." The vote was carried, 148 being in favour of the grant and 59 against.

The parliamentary grants of 1818 and 1824 were never repeated. Parliament ceased to be exclusively Anglican and the Church found it possible to raise enough money from its own resources. Before 1833 about £6,000,000 had been spent from all sources on church building, and the problem of over-large parishes was ceasing to be one of building and becoming one of conversion. But the parliamentary grants deserve honourable mention; they were not simply dictated by fears of revolution. They represent the government's decision to accept the request of the Church to come to its aid. The minutes of the Church Building Society reveal that the initiative came from a group of lay churchmen; the parliamentary debates make it clear that though motives were mixed and the desire to maintain morale or dish the dissenters was a factor, the primary motive of the majority which carried the measures was to support Christianity. The Church would have built the churches in any event; both Church and State did themselves credit by co-operating to tackle the job more quickly. The story and its implications are encouraging at a time when England is one of the few remaining countries where Church and State still regard each other with mutual respect.

ALAN WEBSTER.

St Paul's Quotations of the Book of Job

THE Book of Job is one to which New Testament writers generally pay little attention. The only direct reference to it occurs in James v, 11, where Job is simply cited as an example of patience. And on the whole the Fathers echo this neglect of the book. They

confine themselves to using a few proof-texts, such as the reference to Leviathan in Job iii, 8, identified as the devil; or the sentence in xiv, 4, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one", as support for the doctrine of original sin. They do not draw out, indeed they do not understand, the true meaning of the book. There is, however, one New Testament writer who has a quite remarkable understanding of the significance of the Book of Job, and that is St Paul.

There are only two places where we can be sure that St Paul is directly quoting the Book of Job, both of them in Romans; but there are several others where it is pretty clear that he has a passage from the book in his mind, and one other where we may guess that its words are not far from his thought. It should be made clear that in none of these passages is St Paul relying for his quotations or references on any form of the LXX which we know. Let us now examine them:

The passage where St Paul has Job most clearly in mind is Romans xi, 33-35, which runs: "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past tracing out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given unto him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?" Now St Paul here is certainly recalling Isaiah xl, 13, 14, and perhaps also Jeremiah xxiii, 18; but it would be unwise to rule out the influence of some verses in Job for the first part of the passage, because he certainly quotes Job in the second part. For the first part, compare Job xi, 7 and 8: "Canst thou by searching find out God? . . . It is high as heaven, what canst thou do? Deeper than Sheol, what canst thou know?"; and Job xv, 8: "Hast thou heard the secret counsel of God? And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?"; and Job xxxvi, 22 and 23: "Behold, God doeth loftily in his power, Who is a teacher like unto him, Who hath enjoined him his way?" Then in the second part we can find two passages in Job which are quite clearly echoed: Job xxxv, 7, "If thou be righteous, what givest thou him, Or what receiveth he of thine hand?"; and Job xli, 11, "Who hath first given unto me, that I should repay him?"

The next passage recalling words in Job is Colossians ii, 14, "having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us". St Paul, I suggest, got this "bond" from Job xxi, 35, "Oh . . . that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written!" And last of all it is instructive to read 1 Corinthians i, 25-29, and then with this passage in mind to read Job xii, 17-22. There is obviously no quotation nor direct reference, but I cannot help thinking that this passage was in St Paul's mind when he wrote the first chapter of 1 Corinthians.

It is noticeable that St Paul does not use Job as an example of patience, nor does he connect him with innocent suffering. He uses the book solely to support his doctrine of the transcendence, the intractability of God. God cannot be calculated, measured, critically

examined, nor put under an obligation. In as far as he uses Job at all, this is the message which St Paul, unlike any other New Testament writer, finds in the book. Now, this is a most interesting fact, because St Paul has (in my view) put his finger on the most important point in the whole book. It is usually held that the profoundest significance of the Book of Job lies in its treatment of the problem of innocent suffering; but in fact this problem, though of course it is treated in the book, only gives occasion for the raising of a much more profound and important problem—the whole problem of the relation between God and man. And it is in its clear perception of the realities of this relation, and its refusal to accept compromise upon the point, that the Book of Job represents an achievement unexampled in the rest of the Old Testament.

Not only does Job maintain steadily, in the face of the attempts of his friends to offer alternative, meretricious explanations, that the innocent suffer without compensation from God and the unrighteous prosper with impunity, but in a series of arguments he establishes that the whole relationship between God and man is unequal, that man is perpetually uneasy and uncertain before God, and that even the most perfect conduct on the part of man cannot remedy this situation. Chapters iii, vii, and x argue that so ephemeral a creature as man is not worth God's plaguing. Chapter vi complains that Job has no standard whereby to know God nor to understand His intentions. And chapter ix brings the gravest charge of all, that man, however morally upright, *cannot* be pure before God. Verses 20-23 and 30-33 of this chapter make this clear: "Though I be righteous, mine own mouth shall condemn me: Though I be perfect, it shall prove me perverse. . . . If I wash myself with snow water, and make my hands never so clean, Yet wilt thou plunge me in the ditch. And mine own clothes shall abhor me." When we reach chapters xxix-xxxi we find the same point driven home in an unforgettable way. Chapter xxix describes the happiness and authority enjoyed by Job in the days of his prosperity; chapter xxx contrasts the misery of his present state. Chapter xxxi sums up, giving a picture, entirely unparalleled in the Old Testament, of Job's moral achievement. Chapter xxxi is, indeed, one of the most important chapters in the Old Testament (and the fact that it never appears entire in any of our recent lectionaries casts a lurid light upon the theological penetration of their compilers), for the moral standard which it presents is so vastly above any other in the Old Testament, so much so as almost to approach that of the Sermon on the Mount. Job did not even look on a woman to lust after her (verse 1); he was fair even to his slaves who quarrelled with him (vv. 13-15), because he believed in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man (that doctrine so often and so inaccurately attributed to Christianity); he did not even rejoice at the downfall of his enemies (verse 29). It might not be difficult to show that the Ten Commandments have been deliberately chosen and deliberately developed in this chapter (I suggest vv. 26-27, Idolatry; verse 30, perhaps Blasphemy; vv. 16-18, perhaps Honouring Parents; vv. 29-30,

Murder; vv. 1-4 and 9-12, Adultery; vv. 5-8 and 38-39, Stealing; vv. 13-15 and 21-22, False Witness; vv. 24-25, Coveting).

And yet the whole point of this amazing chapter is to show that in spite of Job's moral greatness he is not righteous before God. God's reply to Job out of the whirlwind, in chapters xxxviii-xlii, only emphasizes this conclusion, for these chapters show God declaring anew, and Job humbly accepting, Job's unrighteousness—that is, his incapacity to be on easy terms with God, to understand Him, or to come near to Him. The conventional prose ending of the book is utterly unconvincing as a solution of this tension, and (we can be morally certain) was never intended as such by the author.

The Book of Job has often been regarded as a brilliant and daring piece of theological speculation off the main line of development of Old Testament thought. This seems to me a complete misunderstanding. The book is, on the contrary, *par excellence* the summit of development and final word in the Old Testament. It might even be called the Epistle to the Romans of the Old Testament, for it brings the reader, at much greater length and in far nobler language than St Paul employed, to precisely the point to which the reader has been brought by Romans iii, 19—"that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgement of God". There are two main lines of thought in the Old Testament concerning the achievement by man of reconciliation with God. One puts its trust in sacrifice and cultural and ritual correctness. The other (represented by Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah vi, and Psalms xl, l, and li, to name the main sources) calls for the obedient, humble mind, the contrite spirit, and the upright character, in contrast to, sometimes in positive opposition to, sacrifice and cult. The author of the Book of Job, alone among Old Testament writers, rejects both. He has none but the most formal and conventional interest in sacrifice and cult (Job i, 5; xlii, 8). And he proclaims quite clearly that the obedient heart, the contrite spirit, and the upright character (all of which Job had) do not avail to win righteousness with God. It is this insight, as St Paul saw, which places the Book of Job, not off the main stream of development of Old Testament thought, but at its consummation and furthest point of achievement.

R. P. C. Hanson.

Father Ignatius at Llanthony

Among the water-colours of J. M. W. Turner there is one which depicts Llanthony Abbey, Monmouthshire. Pale and insubstantial, the ancient grey walls rise out of a belt of mist in the middle distance. Behind them there looms a steep mountainside, dark and forbidding; in the foreground a clear stream runs swiftly between its wooded banks. It is a composition thoroughly romantic in spirit. The scene itself is indeed wild and remote. Llanthony is to

be found in an isolated valley of the Black Mountains, where the boundaries of the three counties of Monmouth, Brecon, and Hereford all meet, in a region of high moorland and silent glens.

Llanthony Priory, to use its correct name, is now no more than a ruin, which has been much diminished since Turner's day. The two massive western towers remain and part of the central tower still stands, but the nave is roofless and grassgrown, and the walls, pierced by lancet windows, are uneven and broken. These ruins lack both the matchless grace and the superb situation of Tintern, but nevertheless they compose a noble and impressive mass of stonework. The valley in which they stand has a peaceful beauty of its own.

For a few years at the beginning of the nineteenth century Walter Savage Landor was in the district. In 1807 he bought the old Priory and its lands for £20,000, and began to build a mansion for himself on the wooded hillside, but his aim to settle there as the Squire of Llanthony was not fulfilled. He met with one difficulty after another in his building plans and in the working of his estate, and after a number of violent quarrels with his neighbours he went off in a rage, not to return for many years. The fine forest trees which can still be seen on the mountain slopes were planted there by Landor during his brief but turbulent stay. But the poet was not the only unusual character who was attracted from the outside world to the solitude of the vale of Ewyas. In 1870 another monastery was built there, not within the precincts of the old Priory, but five miles farther up the valley, at Capel-y-ffin, and there the buildings, now dilapidated, still stand. The founder was an Anglican clergyman, the Rev. Joseph Leycester Lyne, who was well known during the last quarter of the nineteenth century as Father Ignatius, a picturesque and controversial figure in Victorian England.

When the building of this monastery was begun, Francis Kilvert, the diarist, was at Clyro in Radnorshire, only a few miles distant, and one spring day he made his way over the mountain to Llanthony to see the monks at work. He wrote: "A few minutes' walk up a lane which is now dry, but which is probably a watercourse in winter, and, looking through the hedge, we exclaimed 'There they are!' Two black figures were working in a sloping patch of ground laid out as a garden, one digging and the other wheeling earth to him in a barrow. They were dressed in long black habits girt round the waist with scourge-cords, knotted at the ends and dangling almost to the ground. The black hoods or cowls were drawn over their heads, leaving their faces bare, and their naked feet were thrust into sandals, with which they went slip-slop along . . . We saw the foundation stone which Father Ignatius came down to lay three weeks ago. Then he returned to London, and at present there are only these two monks in residence. . . . The monks, as usual, had chosen a pretty and pleasant place on a fine slope at the foot of the mountain, where there was good soil and plenty of good water, a trout stream and sand for mortar."

The black-clad monks toiling away in the sunlit green fields made

a bizarre picture which deeply impressed Kilvert. Six months later he was back at Llanthony, this time having the good fortune to meet Ignatius himself. "He struck me as being a man of gentle, simple, kind manners, excitable and entirely possessed by the one idea. His head and brow are very fine, the forehead beautifully rounded and very imaginative. The face is a very saintly one, and the eyes extremely beautiful, earnest, and expressive, a dark soft brown. When excited they seem absolutely to flame. He wore the black Benedictine habit, with two loose wings or pieces falling in front and behind. I stood in the lane near the Honddu bridge for some time talking with Father Ignatius. I asked him if he would not find an ordinary dress more convenient and less open to insult and objection. But he scouted the idea of abandoning his distinctive monastic dress. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, he said, had suggested the same thing, but he had turned the tables on the Bishop by asking him why he did not discard his own foolish and meaningless dress, far more irrational than the Benedictine habit. The Bishop laughed and said there was a good deal in what Father Ignatius said. He thinks the Bishops are coming around to his side. We shook hands and departed."

Such was Ignatius, earnest, ardent, single-minded, as he appeared at the outset of his Llanthony adventure. His encounters with bishops had not always ended as pleasantly as the affable conversation which he recounted to Kilvert. In fact, Ignatius' ten years in Holy Orders had been a time of almost unbroken conflict with authority. Now aged thirty-three, he had been ordained in Wells Cathedral in 1860, but on the unusual condition that he should remain in deacon's orders for three years and refrain from preaching. For these restrictions there was good reason. At school and college, at St Paul's and Glenalmond, he had held extreme High Church views, and at Inverness, where he spent a year in church work, he showed a strong individualism which involved him in disputes with his superiors. Already he had in his mind the idea of the monastic life. After his ordination it was much the same story.

Taking a curacy at St Mary's, Plymouth, he came into contact with Pusey, and with Priscilla Sellon, the first nun in the Anglican Church after the Reformation, and in a short time Lyne had actually formed in the town a small religious community for men. It soon collapsed, and the youthful founder, known as Brother Joseph and clad in a monk's habit, proceeded to Belgium to study there the organization of the Benedictine Order. A second curacy at St George's-in-the-East in the dockland of London followed, but this was of short duration, because Brother Joseph insisted on wearing his Benedictine habit, and the usual disagreement sprang up. But, unabashed by the storms of controversy he had created, Brother Ignatius, as he now called himself, calmly continued his defiance of ecclesiastical authority. He published a pamphlet advocating the revival of the monastic life in England; he launched two more communities, one near Norwich and the other near Ipswich, but they were both prohibited by the Bishop; he preached at various churches

in the city of London, but in so unorthodox a vein that he was suspended; he interrupted the proceedings of a Church Congress at Bristol in order to make a speech which caused an uproar; he assumed the style of Father Ignatius, but no bishop would ordain him priest. This was Ignatius' background when, with the aid of a generous gift of money, he was enabled to purchase land at Llanthony in 1869 for the building of a monastery.

At its inception the Llanthony community consisted of two other professed monks and four or five novices. In the early days they had to endure considerable hardship, living in rough conditions until the buildings were finished. Ignatius wrote: "As the winter frosts began, our sufferings were great indeed. I myself often rose at 5 a.m. from my bed in the cold damp shed, the blanket that covered me really steaming with the damp. I had to quickly make my own bed to call the brothers from the barn to sing Prime with me in my shed—the 'Abbot's Lodge'. Of an evening, after supper and Vespers, we would kindle a fire on the muddy floor of the unfinished and desolate cloister, fastening up a blanket for shelter from the cutting wind." But in the summer, with the buildings completed, it was a very different picture. The Abbot wrote enthusiastically: "How glad everything is looking! How the noisy Honddu shines like silver in the sun, and joins its music to the sheep's bleat, the oxen's low, the bee's hum, the breeze's breath. All nature seems triumphant in its wild glad freedom here. . . ." There is no doubt that the surroundings at Llanthony were well-nigh perfect for the life of a religious community, for as Gerald the Welshman had written of the old Priory in the twelfth century, "It is far removed from the bustle of mankind, in a lovely valley. . . . The situation is truly calculated for religion, and more adapted to canonical discipline than all the monasteries of the island of Britain—a place truly fitted for contemplation."

But as time went on all was not well within the monastery walls. The great weakness in Ignatius' position was that his connexion with the Benedictine Order was, to say the least, tenuous, and he recognized no authority above himself as Abbot. He was a law unto himself in matters concerning the Rule of Benedict, omissions and additions being made at his behest, and much of the ceremonial employed at Llanthony he devised himself. He claimed to have restored the primitive Rule of Benedict, but his acquaintance with the history of monasticism was not wide, and his own temperament, exuberant and volatile, was far from ideal for the head of a religious house. He imposed upon the monks a rule strict but capricious, while he lived himself as he pleased. There seems to have been no firm basis for the monastic life of the brethren, and men came and went all too frequently, growing tired of the unstable conditions. Various difficulties arose. A revolt broke out against Ignatius' leadership, and a legal action was brought against him in 1873 whereby he was ordered to release one of the novices, a ward in Chancery. But there were, in addition to these troubles, two serious handicaps which affected Ignatius' work—his frequent

absences from the monastery, and his deacon's orders, in which he perforce remained for many years.

He was by no means permanently at Llanthony, but travelled up and down the country preaching and addressing meetings, spending two or three weeks away at a time. Ignatius conceived himself to be a wandering friar as much as a cloistered monk, but there was another, and more practical, reason for his journeys. He had to raise money by means of these preaching-tours, and they represented the monastery's chief source of income. His black habit, his tonsured head, his eloquent persuasive voice, were familiar during the seventies and eighties in London and in the north, in lecture-halls and theatres more often than in churches. Indeed, for sixteen years he was not allowed to preach in any church in the London diocese, until in 1885 Bishop Frederick Temple, deciding not to continue Bishop Tait's inhibition, wrote frigidly: "There is no illegality in Mr Lyne's preaching. . . . Mr Lyne has said and done a great many very silly and some very wrong things, but it hardly seems worth while to give him the opportunity of calling himself a martyr and a victim of persecution. People need not go to listen to him, and I do not think that those who do will get much harm from so foolish a man." This was no doubt the official view of the Church of England at the time, but Ignatius had for years been welcomed by a wider audience. As early as 1872 he had appeared at a public debate before a crowded gathering at the Hall of Science in Old Street in London. His opponent was the celebrated atheist Charles Bradlaugh, and the champion and the adversary of Christianity, an incongruous pair, walked away from the platform after their heated discussion with arms linked.

Year after year the monk of Llanthony was engaged in this mission preaching in various parts of the country. There is ample evidence that his speaking style was fluent and impassioned, and he attracted, and impressed, large crowds. One eye-witness wrote: "To say that I was deeply impressed by his preaching would but faintly describe what I desire to say. The first sermon I heard at Carmarthen awoke me to the fact that until then I had been living in a state of spiritual lethargy, and during the mission at Tenby, by God's grace, the Gospel message, delivered in its simplicity by this Evangelist monk, was permitted to reach me and do that for me which four decades of a superabundance of dogmatic preaching had failed in doing." The following extract from a sermon preached on Queen Victoria's Jubilee in 1887 by Ignatius at Westminster Town Hall gives a good idea of his oratory—rich and picturesque, but to our taste somewhat florid and vague: "Brethren, we Christians cannot ever expect the world to be able to right itself. You recollect how before Christ came the world had very great advantages so far as temporal prosperity was concerned. Look at the Roman Empire—look at the height of civilization it reached: how the arts and sciences had reached almost their acme of perfection. Then the artist touched the marble and it leapt into life; then the sculptor whispered on the stone and it seemed almost to speak. Art had reached an almost

almighty power. Listen to the warblings of the sweetest melodies amongst the luscious civilization of the Grecian isles! How everything that was most refined and beautiful was embodied in their worship. They decked their worship with the most exquisite splendours of poetic beauty: but the human race was at the same time sunk in the deepest depths of depravity. The human heart was at its very lowest state of degradation. Philosophers tried to feed the energisings and longings in the heart of man—but they failed."

Ignatius had been at Llanthony for twenty years before he associated himself with Welsh life. When he did so, it was with all his usual impetuous enthusiasm. Invited to speak at the Brecon National Eisteddfod in 1889, he gave a rousing if extravagant address which greatly appealed to the crowd. "Your Christianity, O people of Cymru, is apostolic," he cried. "It was brought to you by your own people direct from the Apostle Paul. The Church of the Cymry existed long before there was any Pope of Rome!" He was admitted to the circle of Bards with the title of Dewi Honddu, and he acquired some knowledge of the Welsh language. The famous handbills anouncing his services now bore the Welsh words *Tangnefedd* and *Y Gwir yn erbyn y Byd* alongside the familiar, boldly printed *Pax* and *Jesus Only*, and the missioner henceforward often described himself as "The Welsh Bard" and "The Monk of the Celtic Church." It was at this period that the monastery at Llanthony, originally dedicated to St Mary and St Dunstan, was re-dedicated to our Lady and St David, the patron saint of Wales. Ignatius was not without a sense of effective display.

In 1890 he crossed the Atlantic, and his handbills fluttered through the streets of New York. He had his usual success in speaking to crowded meetings, one of which was held at the Welsh Congregational Chapel in East 11th Street, New York City, but the various Church authorities of America did not receive him warmly, and the press drew attention to his irregular position. It was of course wildly inconsistent. Here was a religious who was a revivalist preacher, an Anglican who was barred from his own pulpit, and above all a deacon who was head of a so-called Benedictine monastery. Despite many requests, no English bishop had during all these years consented to raise Ignatius to the priesthood, but at length this, his great desire, was brought about. When he was over sixty he was ordained priest, not by an Anglican bishop but by an unknown prelate called Mar Timotheus, Syrian Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Old Catholics of America.

The ordination took place at Llanthony amid scenes of solemn splendour, but the episode will not bear close examination. This Syrian Archbishop was a French-American named Joseph René Villatte, who had been connected with more than one communion and had wandered in many lands; his own consecration was obscure. One fine summer evening in 1898 this personage arrived at Llanthony, and a few days later Ignatius, weary of the neglect of Anglican bishops for thirty-eight years, grasped the opportunity thus presented and was ordained according to the Old Catholic rite. In

many ways his position now became more ambiguous than ever. This strange ordination indeed was typical of much in Ignatius' curious career. Flamboyant and dramatic, abounding in piety, in solemnity, in devotion, it was nevertheless essentially unsound; and many modern critics would unhesitatingly add the harsh word "bogus". But they would be wrong. With his faults of temperament and errors of taste, with his facile and sentimental view of the monastic life, Ignatius was nevertheless profoundly sincere. His mission preaching had the unmistakable ring of conviction, and it was in that field that his best work was done. He died in 1908, and was buried at Llanthony. His monastery did not long survive him, and its crumbling walls are now as silent and deserted as those of the medieval priory which also stands in the noble vale of Ewyas.

T. H. Bowen.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Ven. John Phillips is Archdeacon of Nottingham.

The Rev. Alan Webster is Vice-Principal of Westcott House, Cambridge.

The Rev. R. P. C. Hanson is Vice-Principal of The Queen's College, Birmingham.

The Rev. T. H. Bowen is Diocesan Chaplain at St Basil's, Birmingham.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE STATE OF THE DEPARTED

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I am indeed grateful for the opportunity you have so kindly given me of replying to the points raised by Dr Robinson and Mr Montefiore in connexion with my article on "Prayers for the departed".

Dr Robinson and I are in substantial agreement. I admit I should have discussed more fully the interpretation of 2 Cor. v, 1-5, particularly as on the face of it that passage appears to imply an individual resurrection immediately after death, and therefore to damage my whole argument. Attractive though Dr Robinson's exegesis is, I am not wholly convinced by it. The most recent exegesis of this passage (Thornton, *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*, pp. 284 ff., and H.-D. Wendland in *N.T. Deutsch, ad loc.*) interprets the *οἰκία ἀχειροποίητος* as the resurrection body, but at the same time repudiates the individualistic conception of the resurrection. St Paul, it is held, fears lest he should die before the Parousia and during the intervening period be left *γυμνός*.

Of Mr Montefiore's three points the first is by far the most important, and I am grateful to him for raising it. I am, however, still convinced that my argument is based not on any specifically Pauline theology, but on the time-scheme presupposed by the

kerygma which underlies not only the Pauline Epistles but the N.T. writings as a whole, including, as Cullmann so persuasively argues in *Christus und die Zeit*, even the Johannine literature. It is, I believe, only an historical accident that it was St Paul who worked out the implications of that time-scheme for the state of the Christian dead, a circumstance which explains why I had to rely so exclusively on quotations from the Pauline Epistles. The fundamental question is the unity of the N.T., a fact which the work of Hoskyns and Dodd in this country and of Schlatter and his disciples in Germany is enabling us increasingly to appreciate.

My inspiration in interpreting the Prayer Book was in fact derived not from Tract XC, but from the Caroline divines. Since it was from this school that the revision of the Prayer Book in 1661 in the main emanated, it is surely as legitimate to interpret their liturgical work in the light of their theology as it is for Dom Gregory Dix to interpret the Cranmer's Prayer Books in the light of the *Defence* and *Answer*. Newman's attempt to bring the Articles into line with the Council of Trent was in comparison a *tour de force*, to say the least of it.

The meaning of 1 Cor. xv, 29 is so obscure, and St Paul's own attitude to the practice alluded to so uncertain, that it seemed best to leave it out of account. Here the appeal to tradition is valid, for had baptism for the dead been more than an eccentric aberration, it would doubtless have survived—but there is, I believe, no trace of it apart from this verse. Once again I was concerned to base my argument, not on the individual eccentricities of N.T. writers or of their churches, but upon common apostolic Christianity.

Yours, etc.,

REGINALD H. FULLER.

THE MOTHER OF GOD

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I should like to make it clear to Mr Williams and any others who may have misunderstood my article in THEOLOGY, April, 1950, that I too believe that the primary question for theology is "Is it true? What is the nature of the evidence and authority by which its truth is established?" That is why so many Anglicans (I include myself) find themselves having to say "not proven" to much traditional Mariology. We come to that verdict on two grounds. First, we believe that an honest review of the scriptural evidence can lead to no other conclusion. Secondly, we believe that the traditional doctrine is vitiated by a failure to grasp the change in the mother-son relationship as the son grows up. In other words, a psychological insight is essential here to the apprehension of theological truth.

If there is an ambiguity in "Motherhood", if at the human level, as we grow up, a real change takes place in the character of this permanent and at all points good and positive parent-relationship,

its relevance to the way we think of Christ's relationship and our relationship to Mary is obvious. For Mary, whatever her exaltation, is a created human being, of whom motherhood is directly predicated as fatherhood cannot be of God. If, in addition, to take this ambiguity into account makes better sense of the biblical evidence, it is very relevant indeed. If a certain way of manipulating the biblical evidence about Mary goes with a failure to recognize this ambiguity, the theologian is within his rights to suggest that the two may be connected. Mr Williams is at liberty to show that this is bad theology, but not to dismiss it as "psychological chitchat".

I am most grateful to Mr Edward Every for stating at greater length and with greater care than I the Orthodox attitude to tradition as expounded by Lossky. By "tradition" in my article I was referring, of course, to the *articulated* and *expressed* tradition of the Church. It is indeed true that the Orthodox claim for it an inarticulate "germinal" prehistory, tracing it back to the divinely guarded memory of Mary and the first disciples, and asserting that it has an authority no less than the written scriptures, being in fact the key by which their true meaning may be unlocked. By taking together Luke ii, 19, 51, viii, 15, 18, 21, and ix, 28 (arbitrarily or led by the tradition?) Lossky claims scriptural warrant for this control of scripture by tradition. The tradition itself, it seems, comes down to us through the Mother of God, whose glory lies "beneath the veil of the silence of the Bible" (Lossky, *Mother of God*, p. 27).

Mr Every's letter, and a further careful reading of the Orthodox papers in this book, drive me to insist yet more strongly that this view of tradition is incompatible with that by which Anglicans theologize and live. To say, as Mr Every does, that tradition as understood by the Orthodox does not inhibit free theological inquiry, but gives it more material, more data, reveals a lamentable confusion of thought. Lossky, for example, not only recognizes that "apart from Church tradition theology would be dumb and unable to justify this astounding glorification [of Mary]": he also has to admit that "some passages in the gospels . . . from a point of view outside Church tradition, seem to contradict quite flagrantly the extreme glorification . . . of the *Theotokos* in the Church" (p. 25). But by claiming that "it is tradition which confers the power of comprehension of the meaning of revealed truth" (p. 26; *cf.* 27-8), he silences the contradictions and squares the scripture with the expressed tradition in a way which makes nonsense of "proving the tradition by the scripture". What is at stake here is the *historicity* of our faith. The question is whether, just as the Christ was truly and "scandalously" incarnate in human flesh, the Gospel testimony is "scandalously" incarnate in human records; whether the Gospel persons and events are locked up in the golden casket of "tradition", or are accessible as part of public history to those whom the Holy Spirit moves to see there the activity of God. In the latter case we must test the later expressions of Church tradition by the apostolic testimony of the New Testament, historically nearer to the events; and in all humility we must sift and cross-examine the sacred text

itself. If most Anglican scholars, orthodox in their doctrine of the Incarnation, have doubts about the full traditional Mariology, it is because they take history seriously, and would submit to the evidence in this way. It is most unfortunate that not one of the Anglican contributors to *The Mother of God* takes as his theme this question of the relation of scripture to tradition, so vital to Anglican theology. Indeed, their work seems to provide too many unhappy examples of using the text of scripture as a thin sugar coating for unscriptural pills. The really excellent Orthodox essays in this book deserve a more adequate reply. Better still, it is to be hoped that this discussion in your journal will encourage a wider Anglican support for the Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius, where these fundamental questions may be further explored.

Yours faithfully,

Lincoln Theological College Basil S. Moss.

REMEMBRANCE SUNDAY

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

I have a great deal of sympathy with Mr Pawley's misgivings about "Remembrance Sunday": yet I think that parts of his article are misleading as to facts, and inconsistent in principle.

He refers to the British Legion's form of service as almost the same as the one he describes. In fact it does not include the hymns "For all the Saints", "Let Saints on earth", and "Onward, Christian Soldiers": it has no preface and no psalm. Instead of a continuous Lesson, it has a collection of texts, including Wisdom iii, 1, 2 but not iii, 8. Nowhere is there any reference to "the Lamb's book of life". This form of service is open to many criticisms, but at least it is far more restrained in its use of the "All Saints' motif". Both the Legion form and the one Mr Pawley describes contain a prayer for the dead: so it is hardly just to speak of "the absence of prayers appropriate to the commemoration of All Souls", or to infer that the fallen "enjoy the status of the canonized Saints". So much for facts. But the question of principle is more important. Mr Pawley quotes with approval John Riland's protest against the claim that "all the dead are subjects of thankfulness; to the total and eternal oblivion of every distinction between the saved and the lost". But this was a protest not against some special form of service, but against the Order for the Burial of the Dead in the Prayer Book, which Mr Pawley considers of unquestionable orthodoxy, and "the universal pattern of commemoration of the dead". (Incidentally, can a local rite of fairly recent origin be a "universal pattern"?) The inferences to be drawn from the indiscriminate use of "in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to eternal life" and "We give thee hearty thanks", etc., are not very different from the inferences Mr Pawley draws from "Remembrance Sunday" services. Indeed, it might be

argued that the source of the latter is already in the former: and that Mr Pawley criticizes by implication the very service he holds up as a model.

Yours faithfully,

Blundeston Rectory,
Lowestoft.

Cyril H. Hubbins.

ROME AND REUNION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

As a diligent and appreciative reader of Theology over a period of many years I must confess that I was deeply disappointed by the spirit and tone of your editorial comments on the recent Papal Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement.

The writer of these comments wholly ignores the significant fact that this Instruction lays it down that from now onwards the bishops ought to make reunion work a special object of their care and attention; that they should use great diligence in giving it prudent encouragement and direction in such a way as to promote the search for truth, and at the same time guard against any dilution of the faith. To this end study, by suitable priests, of the ecumenical movement and everything connected with it is to be organized in every diocese and the bishop kept informed of progress made.

All this of course marks a notable advance in the interest felt by the Holy See in the methods and work of the movement, and in the extent to which it is prepared positively to encourage an eirenic attitude of mind in bishops and clergy.

We do not of course expect readers of Theology to accept all the doctrine of the Encyclical Letters *Satis Cognitum, Mortalium Animos,* and *Mystici Corporis,* but every Christian body, if it claims to represent Christ in the world, must hold as essential some truths concerning the Church which He founded. The doctrine contained in these Encyclicals is believed by us to be what He taught and teaches—in consequence we can never compromise on it, and all our ecumenical work must take it for a starting-point.

In the Papal Instruction there are a number of safeguarding regulations and warnings couched in language which gives perhaps to those unfamiliar with such documents the impression of a somewhat rigid supervision and control. Two points in this connexion should be borne in mind. Our bishops with the Pope at their head are regarded by us as placed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God, and their supreme responsibility is to watch over and preserve intact the deposit of faith. The Pope over the universal Church; the bishops each in his own diocese. It is a well-attested fact that the heart is always liable to conquer the head, and there is a danger, from which Catholic ecumenical work in certain continental countries has not been altogether exempt, that the sudden realization of the full meaning of unity in Christ, brought about by intimate participation in it, will produce an unconscious desire to over-

emphasize doctrines which lead directly towards that unity, at the expense of those that will be considered obstacles to it. It is this fact in particular that is responsible for the caution in making a new and hitherto untried experiment which is perceptible throughout the Papal Instruction.

In his views on this caution your editorial writer appears to be dominated by the idea that authority in the Roman Catholic Church is largely repressive, ready like an over-zealous policeman to pounce upon the slightest deviation from the narrow path of official orthodoxy and enforce the appropriate penalties. He seems to regard every precaution to be taken by episcopal authority, in the extremely delicate and arduous work of doctrinal discussion between theologians of different allegiances, in this light, and he contrives, in a footnote, to make it appear almost contemptible that the Pope and the bishops should wish to ensure that those who take part in such discussion may be men theologically equipped for their task and able in consequence to be relied on to base all their work for unity firmly on the doctrines of the Church. He appears to see something sinister in warnings to be watchful that inordinate zeal for unity may not lead to disproportionate emphasis, entailing distortion of the truth. It even looks as if he disapproves of any care being taken to avoid the human and easy transition, once the eirenic mind has been developed, from minimizing, in Reformation history, the shortcomings of Catholics and exaggerating by caricature the errors of the Reformers—the vice of controversialists whose minds are not eirenic—to exaggerating the shortcomings and glossing over the errors.

By the time he comes to mention the information which the Pope and the Sacred Congregation not unnaturally wish to receive about the widespread work for reunion which they hope to see developing in the future, this information appears to have become in his imagination almost a series of police dockets to go into the Vatican files to be used to castigate any peccant theologian who may inadvertently have done something to help forward the reunion of Christendom.

I trust you will forgive me for saying that this editorial comment is quite out of keeping with the sane and judicial spirit that has always characterized THEOLOGY in its better moments, and I can only wish that in one of these moments its Editor had chosen to deal with this most vital subject.

Yours faithfully,

HENRY ST JOHN, O.P.

BLACKFRIARS SCHOOL,
LLANARTH,
RAGLAN, MON.
May 4, 1950.

* * * * *

[We are sorry if the tone of our editorial comment was such as to give pain to Fr St John and his fellow-churchmen. We certainly ought to have noted and welcomed the fact that a principal object of the Papal Instruction was to lay it down that bishops should in

future make reunion work a special object of their care and encouragement. An Anglican may too easily suppose that the duty of promoting unity among Christians is universally accepted as inherent in the episcopal office. But reflection on some of the utterances of Cardinal Griffin and on the attitude of some of his predecessors would have suggested the need for this element in the Papal Instruction. On the other hand, we do not admit that it is unreasonable or injudicious to suspect the Vatican of accompanying encouragement with provisions for rigid control. We are sufficiently acquainted with its history to know of what repressive measures it is capable. For a single and pertinent illustration reference may be made to the remarkable tergiversations of the late Mgr Batiffol in relation to the objective of the Malines Conversations as revealed in his letter of June 24, 1926, to the papal nuncio in Paris and his *Note remise à S.S. Pie XI* of April 12, 1927. Naturally we hope in the present instance that Fr St John's confidence in the liberality of the Vatican's intentions will not be deceived.—Ed. Theology.]

BOOK REVIEWS

Beyond Realism and Idealism. By Wilbur Marshall Urban. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

In this book Professor Urban writes about those two meanings of knowledge represented by the terms realism and idealism. He points out that the terms have, in many cases, "entirely changed places", and he warns us against "the tyranny of names", urging that any conciliation is futile unless we are sure we know what we are talking about.

"What is true of knowledge of things cannot be true of the knowledge of knowledge." Realism and idealism represent postulates "necessary for an intelligible concept of knowledge", and these postulates rest upon logically unsupported judgments of value, which constitute the "resistance" of the one and the "driving force" of the other. Examination of these judgments of value shows that we are concerned, not with a contradiction, but with an opposition; and by an analysis of the "meanings of mind-independence and mind-dependence" we may hope to expose their minimal demands, and show that they are compatible and complementary, and that there is "a half-way house . . . which avoids the exclusive logics" of either. The endless and unresolved debate between realism and idealism suggests that the postulates of each are necessary, and that the opposition can be met and overcome dialectically.

This book ought to be read not only by professional philosophers (the author expects that his position will "scarcely commend itself" to the majority of such), but also by teachers and clergymen and others who are concerned to think about the nature of knowledge. It will not be easy going. The style is dull; there are some puzzling constructions; there is a good deal of repetition; and there are not a few misprints. And it is much easier to attend to the first six

chapters than it is to the last four. This may partly be because Chapter VII on the epistemological implications of modern science reads as though it were originally written in that other age of the middle thirties; and because, in the course of Chapter VIII, on the implications of the humanities for the author's problem, he calls July, 1939, "recent" (p. 205, n. 2). And much has happened to modify our thinking about both science and human nature since then. But the book should certainly be read, perhaps first as much for what it suggests as for the way it argues; and in any case for the increase of "charity of mutual interpretation".

In the last chapter Professor Urban argues that the "entire European tradition in philosophy, with which our culture is bound up, is beyond the issue of epistemological realism and idealism", and hints at the wider importance of this issue by pointing out that "scepticism regarding human reason and knowledge is the root . . . of scepticism in morals and religion".

The undated preface of this book was apparently written in 1942 (see p. 5, n. 2, and add twenty-five years to 1917), and in a note on p. 181 December, 1939, is described as "recent". Footnotes on pp. 161 and 233 take us to 1944; but the book itself was not published till 1949. The book serves as an illustration of some contemporary difficulties of publishing, and of the desirability of dating if the risk of confusion is to be avoided.

SOUTHWELL. H. C. L. HEYWOOD.

THE CHRISTIAN WAY. By Sydney Cave. Nisbet. 16s.

Even the skill of Dr Olive Wyon's translations cannot expunge those obscurer Germanic allusions from the works of Emil Brunner which baffle the average English reader of theology. But here is a book on Christian ethics which is essentially English, essentially Protestant, and essentially contemporary, by a well-known scholar (Dr Cave is Principal of New College, London) who loves learning not merely for learning's sake. Admittedly *The Christian Way* says nothing that is not in *The Divine Imperative*, but for every one priest who can afford 25s. to buy and twenty-five days to read Brunner's great work there will be ten who would profit by Dr Cave (276 pages). Theological students, too, who may have been bewildered to find that the elements of moral theology necessary for G.O.E. can be expounded with copious reference to St Thomas Aquinas and only casual mention of our Lord may welcome a work of New Testament theology which treats the Sermon on the Mount as more than just a clearer definition of the pattern of human behaviour enjoined by the natural law. Dr Cave is at pains to make clear how our Lord's words are pertinent, for in the recent past the teaching of Christ has been mutilated into a sentimental irrelevance. But Dr Cave would have paid a greater tribute, perhaps, to his master P. T. Forsyth, "who helped him to find in the Cross the centre of his thinking", if he had *assumed* our agreement that "the significance of Jesus lies . . . in the proclamation of what God has

done in Him, as well as in the record of what He taught", and not spent the first 60-odd pages in asserting it—in 1950.

However, we gladly forgive Dr Cave the tedium of this familiar ground for the pleasure of Parts II and III—"Methods and Motives" and "Life in Community"—which include admirable chapters on Faith and Works, Natural Law, Asceticism, the Orders of Creation, and Marriage. His remarks on Family Planning are reasonable enough to those who take the line of Lambeth, 1930, but he does not mention the problems of the sterilization of the unfit or artificial human insemination. Nor does he say anything about education, gambling, or euthanasia. His discussion of war is all very correct, but it does not ring with the conviction that the Lord will come again and that God's purpose will be vindicated in history.

The impression left by the book is of a readable and vigorous exposition which deserves to be widely used by Anglicans, unless they are already familiar with the standard works of continental theologians.

HOVE. WILFRID BROWNING.

THE BLESSING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By J. E. Fison. Longmans. 5s. 6d. and 8s. 6d.

This book is a timely and vigorous plea for the recovery by the Church of a lively and intelligent belief in the person and power of the Holy Spirit. Canon Fison is convinced that for all our professions (many of them, it must be admitted, vague and perfunctory) we have in fact silently dethroned the Third Person of the Trinity and have set up in His stead various idols of our own. In so doing, we have effectively prevented Him from manifesting His presence among us for the renewal of the life of the Church, and have forfeited His characteristic blessing. None, apart from the Quakers, escapes the author's castigation. Some have committed the apostasy of abandoning in their practice the truths of the Gospel to which they continue to proclaim their adherence; others, the blasphemy of claiming a monopoly of the Spirit and so denying His self-evident working when it does not fit in with their preconceived ideas. And all are convicted of idolatry. For the Holy Spirit, Catholics (Roman and other) have substituted the Church, the ministry, the Sacrament of the altar, or the Blessed Virgin Mary; Evangelicals, the Bible or personal experience; liberals and Modernists, the human reason. Lack of faith in the Spirit has led each denomination and each church party to cling at all costs to its special claims and doctrines, fearful of moving one degree from the position to which it has become committed. To recover that faith means for all an experience of the cross, on the further side of which alone can the blessing of the Holy Spirit be given.

That blessing is made known through the reciprocal relation of meeting, and Canon Fison believes that there is a real reluctance in the Church to take the risks which must attend all meeting —— an unwillingness to trust unreservedly in the Holy Spirit, whose

presence and power are made manifest in the encounter between *I* and *Thou*. There is no doubt that he is right, though this does not mean that his readers will agree with everything in this book. Many will feel that Canon Fison often weakens his case by over-statement or over-simplification, and that "there is none that doeth good, no not one" loses something of its force by too much repetition. But this should not deter them from pondering carefully his forthright and sincere challenge to a Church which has neglected the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to its great cost; if they are candid, they will have to admit that many of his criticisms are justified, and call for action.

EDINBURGH. SHERWIN BAILEY.

THE METHODS OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. By Clifford M. Jones. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

"R.I." is probably still the worst taught subject in our State schools, and this for at least three reasons. One is the general failure to apply to it the diversity of method and approach which has revolutionized the teaching of other material. Mr Jones prefers to speak of "Christian Education" and to widen the meaning to include "the whole of education approached from the Christian point of view, conducted in the Christian spirit and demonstrating the Christian way of life". "The aim of Christian education is nothing less than to make Christians." Nevertheless it is with matters of method in the narrower sense that the book is chiefly concerned.

And an excellent little book it is, to be warmly recommended to teachers of all age groups. Mr Jones not only gives valuable general advice about the right approach for the different age groups, he also discusses modern "activity" methods in detail in relation to these different groups, and each chapter has an admirable bibliography, so that if we fail to make use of models, pictures, films, filmstrips, flannelgraphs and other visual aids, puppets and dramatic art, it can no longer be because we do not know how to set about it.

His advice is thoroughly practical, and it is to be hoped that the book will be widely used and will do something to break down the attitude of, for instance, the head mistress who excused the (very general) practice of putting two classes together for R.I.—making a total of about a hundred children, but giving one teacher a much-needed free period—on the ground that it was the only lesson where there was no "activity".

Mr Jones is alive to the opportunity of the moment and the book is written to encourage and stimulate the young teacher, and so, wisely, and not because he is not well aware of them, he only touches on the other two reasons for the neglect of R.I. One is abysmal ignorance of the material. "Students", he tells us, "must at least know the material they will be called upon to teach. This includes a knowledge of the main contents of the Bible, including the Apocrypha, some idea of how the Bible was written and how it has been transmitted to us, an outline of Christian doctrine and acquaintance with the history of the Christian Church." How rightly

he adds that every training college lecturer in this subject must hope for the day when the course is extended to three years!

The other reason is the indifference, apathy, perplexity and hostility with which the subject is variously approached. "The ideal teacher of religious knowledge is a devout Christian whose teaching is marked by real scholarship in his subject." Such teachers are rare, as Mr Jones well knows, and while modern educational methods are a real help to the good teacher, they can never be a substitute for accurate knowledge and living experience. As the old lady said to the débutante, "My dear, if you're all right, it doesn't matter what you do, but if you're not all right—well, it doesn't matter either." "It is not too much to say that if (the 1944 Act) were fully implemented it could revolutionize the Christian education given to our children in this generation." "The churches now reach only a small minority of the people . . . only the teachers in the schools are in touch with every future citizen." The harvest indeed is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that He send forth labourers into his harvest.

Mabel Burdess.

Edge Hill Training College,
Ormskirk.

The Unknown God. By Alfred Noyes. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

This is a notable book. It displays profound insight, literary, psychological, and religious. When it appeared, in 1934, we were not so accustomed as we now are to hearing about the contemporary bewilderment regarding fundamental values; nor, on the other hand, were we any more used to hearing it declared that the meaning of the universe is to be found in suffering, and particularly in the suffering of the Cross. It insists on some of those elementary truths that are so easily seen by simple common sense, so easily missed by the highly educated: for example, that the expression on a person's face is something more "real" than the electrons that compose it. Again and again the author traces the limitations and falsities in the "scientific" arguments of the sceptics.

Yet it is difficult to believe that the book will produce many converts in the present decade. It is dated. As a reviewer said when it appeared, it is the autobiography of a generation. And the autobiography of one generation rarely offers much spiritual nourishment to the succeeding generation. Who are the targets of Mr Noyes's criticisms? Darwin and T. H. Huxley, Haeckel, Swinburne. Who reads these writers now? To whom do their names mean live problems? A later generation, my own, was disturbed by the findings of the Freudians and the endocrinologists; the present generation of students is troubled by—what? Perhaps by ignorance more than anything. These young men have been brought up, not in a society possessed of strong convictions which appear to clash with fresh knowledge, but in one which hardly knows what convictions are. Much of the argument must strike them as so much waste of paper.

Many agnostics whose training has been scientific would here find their false assumptions and faulty logic refuted. But would they read the book? The style is consistently "literary" (we read about "a sundering gulf", the "eagle-pinions" of a philosophy), the argument constantly reinforced by poetic intuitions: these are qualities that the scientist is very apt to distrust; he wants something barer, more factual. It may well be argued that unless the scientist can be persuaded to enlarge his vision to take due account of certain natural intuitions, he will not be convertible; but I cannot feel that Mr Noyes would capture his confidence: the framework of deep personal assumptions or values expressed by the style would be too alien. The convulsions of Western civilization in our time have broken the old moulds of human experience, so that even when the sceptic uses the arguments of science, he no longer represents the "honest doubt" of the Victorian agnostic but quite fresh paradigmatic experiences—those profound experiences, part valuation, part interpretation, which are as the vine to the branches of subsequent beliefs and judgments. Nobody could claim that this book is in tune with, and therefore in a position to convert, the world of 1950.

K. G. Collier.

Exeter.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Pain of Christ. By Gerald Vann, O.P. Blackfriars, Oxford. 5s.

The Eight Deadlier Sins. By H. C. Libby. Longmans. 4s. and 2s. 6d.

It is perhaps rather unfortunate that these two books should be reviewed together: to do so is to invite comparison, and comparisons are notoriously odious. Fr Vann's book is deceptively simple; Mr Libby's is wordily pretentious.

The Pain of Christ comprises in the main a series of sermons preached in Westminster Cathedral during Lent, 1947. It aims at helping the average Christian to a deeper realization of the nature and relevance of our Lord's Passion, and the earnest reader, willing to essay more fully the paths of prayer and penance, will undoubtedly be helped. All of the sermons are good; some of them—*e.g.*, The Stillness of Mary—are outstanding. There is nothing specifically Roman Catholic about this writing: it belongs to the heritage of Christendom.

Appended is an Aquinas paper on the Sorrow of God in which Fr Vann deals suggestively with the impassibility of God, with the relationship between time and eternity, and with the sacrificial aspect of the Mass. Anglican theologians have sometimes felt that the Tridentine formulation of this last leaves the doctrine obscure: Fr Vann's comments are helpful and illuminating.

It is always interesting to see what reading has fed the mind of a writer. Apart from strictly theological sources, Fr Vann draws from

T. S. Eliot, C. S. Lewis, Dorothy Sayers, and Helen Waddell amongst our contemporaries.

It is a pity that this reprint suffers from some dirty type and rather cheap paper. The subject matter deserves a better production.

One is always suspicious of a literary style which makes extensive use of exclamation marks and queries. Mr Libby's somewhat tortuous discourse jerks its way forward by such aids, together with "nays" and "verilys" and "so to speaks". The best thing about his book is the title, worthy of C. S. Lewis, and the next best, his selection of sins from the Litany. The book opens with a dissertation on God the Creative Artist. (Capital letters are important throughout.)

Much of what he says has been more memorably said by Clutton Brock and Dorothy Sayers. The rest deals in a discursive way with Blindness of Heart, Pride, Vainglory, etc., and ends with a chapter on The God of Hope.

The author claims to have painted these sins "with a light touch". Perhaps that is what is fundamentally wrong with this book: you can't paint sin with a light touch; or at any rate, and particularly in a Lent book, you shouldn't. The Bishop of London speaks of Mr Libby's work as helpful and exhilarating. With all modesty, at least one reader begs to differ.

North Berwick. Lawrence Wilson.

Jacob's Ladder. By Nicolette Gray. Faber and Faber. 21s. net.

This book is obviously the fruit of an immense amount of loving research into the minds of the Anglo-Saxon and twelfth-century artists whose works are so wonderfully reproduced. Nevertheless it may be doubted if the author has achieved her purpose of teaching children about the Bible as the sequence of God's revelation to man. Nicolette Gray believes that children can best be taught religion by allegory, a theory which Phyllis Dent emphatically denied.

Some of the ideas expressed are beyond the grasp of an intelligent child of fourteen, let alone the infants whom the author appears to be addressing in her frequent appeals, "Look!" For example, the ark is the Church (p. 26) and the raven "the people who seem to be in the Church but do not really belong there"; while on p. 84 St Peter leaves the boat "which reminds us of the ark" and we are to try to live the new life by walking on the water. Finally (p. 100), "Our Lord is Noah the steersman and we are all inside the ark . . . and the wood out of which it is made is the wood of the cross."

On the other hand, an acute child would demur at the description of sheep and oxen *sitting* by the stream (p. 52) and demand why we see God "darkly, *as in a glass*" (p. 14)—a Scriptural phrase which requires explanation.

The book is written by a Roman Catholic for children of her own Church, a fact not apparent at first sight. It may be predicted that parents and godparents will appreciate it more highly than the children for whom they may purchase it. Phyllis Graham.

MOMENTS OF LIGHT. By Hubert Van Zeller, O.S.B. Burns Oates. 7s. 6d.

This is a book of "Notes on the Spiritual Life". It goes almost without saying, for the author is a Benedictine, that the notes are good and that they deal sensibly with the heart of the matter.

It may be that a great many people would be helped considerably by the notes in the earlier part of the book, particularly those dealing with Meditation, Aspirations, Prayer of Simple Regard, Transition Periods in Mental Prayer, From Meditation to Acts, etc. Persons who are experiencing the bewilderment and difficulties of the "transition period" may find a good deal of help here. The note on "Doubts about Idleness and Delusion" is very good. So also are those on Temptation and Temptation Screening the Gift—"Most temptations are not so much to this or to that sin *primarily*, but to lose confidence in Him"—"For humility to be worked into the soul there has to be, all along the line, the *sense* of failure without the *fact* of it." There are two notes for priests in the earlier part of the book—"The Cross in Preaching, Practice, and Effect", where he says: "No apostolate can be fruitful unless the would-be apostle is prepared both to preach the cross and, still more, to carry it . . . the shepherd's first duty is to feed his sheep, not to beguile or fleece them . . . the fare must be seasoned with the salt of the cross." Again there is a note on Spiritual Direction—"The director will have, in the course of guiding his penitents, to impart instruction and issue directives, but these are not the main duties. His aim should be to bring out what is already there rather than over-load the soul with what he thinks ought to be added. There's no skill in putting rabbits into an empty hat; there's a great deal in taking them out of one. Potentialities are to be developed, then, rather than methods and regulations imposed." Perhaps these may indicate the quality of this book.

One is left wondering—particularly towards the end—whether the sort of people who would wish to read these Notes, and are capable of appreciating them (that is, possess the experience to appreciate them), would not be better employed in consulting more substantial works on the subject. This is, of course, what Van Zeller wishes them to do. Whether his hope that the reading of his Notes will encourage this it is impossible to say.

ABERDEEN. KENNETH STRACHAN.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. By Arthur H. Ryan. Clonmore and Reynolds. 8s. 6d.

CHURCH AND CITY. By C. E. Douglas. S.P.C.K. 2s.

The second of these books presents the text of four lectures preached in the autumn of 1949 in the Church of St Michael Paternoster Royal, College Hill, in London. The lectures are rambling and miscellaneous, returning only irregularly to the theme of their title. They contain two misquotations: Wordsworth never committed the solecism (p. 14) of making "law" rhyme with "more",

nor did he write "Do what thou canst", but "Give what thou canst"; and Cecil Spring-Rice did not write (p. 39), "And hour by hour and silently her shining bounds increase, For all her ways are righteousness and all her paths are peace", but "And soul by soul and silently her shining bounds increase. And her ways are ways of gentleness, and all her paths are peace". This habit of quoting from memory emphasizes the general impression these lectures give that they represent Canon Douglas thinking aloud rather than carefully preparing a manuscript for the press. But there is in them some interesting and not merely destructive criticism of the official policy of London diocese in its reorganization.

The first book is a popular apology for the Roman Catholic Church. Its general tone is moderate and, granted Monsignor Ryan's beliefs, fair. Its treatment of history is inevitably too sketchy and its acceptance of conjecture inevitably too confident. The account of the history of the Eastern Orthodox Church, for instance, on pp. 40-41 is for the most part sheer caricature. The treatment of evidence in the New Testament and sub-apostolic age is very uncritical. The author apparently assumes (p. 86) without explanation that the Epistle to the Galatians was written after the Council of Jerusalem; Renan, E. Hatch, and Harnack seem to represent to him the latest non-Roman-Catholic scholarship on the subject of episcopacy (pp. 93-94); the implication (on p. 117) that Clement of Rome, as the successor of St Peter, had authority over the Apostle John, his contemporary, is something of a shock; and such statements as "In Rome [Peter] was crucified in the Circus of Nero in the year 67. The universal Church immediately recognized his successor in the see of Rome as succeeding to his primatial powers" (p. 107) do not inspire confidence. Only one point seems to us unscrupulous, and that is the author's confident acceptance as true (pp. 117-118) of the wild conjecture that *προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης* in the first paragraph of Ignatius' *Letter to the Romans* means "having supreme jurisdiction over the universal Church", without even mentioning the embarrassing fact that in this letter St Ignatius does not once name the bishop of the Roman Church.

The Queen's College,
Birmingham.

R. P. C. Hanson.

Viewpoints. No. 9. Reasonable Living. By T. E. Jessop. No. 14. Poetry and Personal Responsibility. By George Every, S.S.M. No. 15. Broadcasting and Society. By H. Grisewood. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d. each.

This series, admirable in its aim, continues to be on the whole admirable in its execution. But the trouble with inviting experts to write brief essays on their own special subject is that not all can come down to the level of the general reader, and as with earlier books in the series, so with this trio, different writers seem to have in view quite different strata of the reading public. Professor Jessop writes apologetic for the outsider—this is what he is outstandingly

good at. Brother George Every writes esoterically about modern poets—this is what *he* is outstandingly good at. Mr Grisewood writes most thoughtfully of the deeper issues in broadcasting; and I think it is fair to say that you need to be something of a Christian philosopher to keep up with him.

One other comment on the series as a whole before detailed consideration of the individual essays—it is fully appreciated that the S.C.M. Press is concerned to publish these books at a low price: that means, I suppose, that they must be printed on cheap paper and deprived of margins. But there is rather a large number of misprints, and the type seems too heavy for the small page.

Professor Jessop is a past master in the technique of adult education. It is good therefore to have in permanent form some of his lectures on life, which have been so successful both in the forces and in civilian audiences. At the outset there are some rhetorical passages of diagnosis of our situation which are more effective than most of such. He proceeds in his argument to re-establish the sphere and status of that reason by which men claim to live. He shows how the positivist account is incomplete because it fails to do justice to experience. There is such a thing as religious experience, and reason is not excluded from it. The self-styled rationalist is shown to be a great deal less rational than he claims to be.

Professor Jessop makes a timely plea for a generosity of approach to life: it just is not rational to compartmentalize experience, and specialize exclusively on your special compartment. Having then established the claims of religion to the reasonable man's attention, the writer goes on to develop—under the title Reason in Morality and Politics—a challenging program of Christian action or rather, more fundamentally, of making ourselves fit to undertake this. He calls for an adult Christianity: "to saddle God with the judgments of a lazy conscience is impious". He ends his essay with an extremely good account of natural law.

I have felt in the last decade that I have been falling out of touch with recent trends in modern poetry: it was with particular pleasure therefore that I looked forward to reading Bro. George Every's book, hoping to find there a lead in this difficult field. What I have said perhaps disqualifies me from reviewing it. I have with sorrow to record that I am still as much in the dark as I was before I started it. It still seems regrettably to be the case that not only must modern poetry be esoteric, but that the criticism and interpretation of it must also share the obscurity of the mysteries.

The book starts with a chapter on Change in the Novel. This is illustrated from a wide range of writers, and often a new slant is given upon their works. But I find the canon of criticism a little arbitrary, and some of the conclusions and judgments ingenious rather than convincing. We are, in our day, learning the very intimate position in human consciousness occupied by myth. To me Bro. George seems to have written like someone who promises to show you the way into a secret treasure-chamber, and then at the door fumbles with the key. He has it, but you are no nearer the vision

of the treasure. I am tempted to feel of his essay as he did about *Finnegan's Wake* (p. 34). This he interpreted and appreciated at last with the help of *A Skeleton Key*.

A central chapter is devoted to Charles Williams and his influence—and rightly so, for he was the dominant and probably most lasting writer in the period under review. After this there are disconnected chapters, separate from the main argument, to demonstrate other influences at work on the younger poets: and the book ends with two chapters, on Changing Standards of Criticism, and on Change in the Modern Mind.

I disqualified myself at the outset from a just appraisal of this book: it is clear that I have failed to appreciate it. But for those who possess the key, for those who are initiated into these modern mysteries with their esoteric language, I am sure that the book is a most valuable survey of the literary movements amidst which we live.

Mr Grisewood is no less deep, but he is surveying society and its convictions and tastes at a more general level and in a less rarefied atmosphere. It is a real privilege to be allowed an insight like this into the philosophy of one who bears the mighty and unprecedented responsibility borne by the people who arrange our broadcast programs. His argument is closely reasoned and therefore does not lend itself to summarizing. Some of the chapter-headings—for instance, Impartiality, Tolerance, the Aims of Broadcasting—are just what you would expect: but when you read the chapters you will find in them a great deal more depth, wisdom, and original thought than those hackneyed phrases suggest. This is a book that should be read by every thoughtful person who is concerned with the present state of society, and wants to do more than be carried along on the conveyor-belt of fashion. Mr Grisewood has made society's responsibility for broadcasting an occasion for a timely essay on a Christian society.

Liverpool College. Ronald Lunt.

Sir Isaac Newton Theological Manuscripts. Selected and Edited with an Introduction by H. McLachlan. Liverpool University Press. 7s. 6d.

The story goes that in 1683 Archbishop Tenison urged Newton to be ordained: "Why will you not? You know more divinity than all of us put together." "Why then", he replied, "I shall be able to do you more service than if I was not in orders." The Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, a master of Latin, and with a competence of Greek and Hebrew, for whom theology had been an absorbing pastime since youth, preferred to remain an amateur theologian—the sort of amateur whose industry gives the professional an uneasy conscience. Yet a temperamental dislike of controversy, and a prudent resolve to maintain good relations with the University and the State, determined that his numerous theological manuscripts should remain unpublished during his life. Afterwards they passed to his

niece, Catherine Conduitt, and thence to the Portsmouth family. When sold, in 1936, about half were acquired by Lord Keynes, after whose death, in 1946, they were presented to King's College, Cambridge.

It is from this collection that Dr McLachlan has been permitted to make a small but representative selection. We can now see, at first hand, something of the range and depth of Newton's researches; the care with which his manuscripts were written and revised; the sincerity of his personal beliefs; and the extent of that heterodoxy which Tenison hardly suspected, Horsley and Brewster tried to conceal, and Professor L. T. More first brought out into the open as recently as 1934. To Newton's admirers this book will be especially welcome. But all students of seventeenth-century religious thought—including those least sympathetic to Sir Isaac's Arian estimate of the Person of Christ, his conclusions about the nature and authority of the Church, his dictum that "religion and Philosophy are to be preserved distinct", his contempt for Athanasius, and his interpretation of many Scriptural passages—will be grateful to Dr McLachlan for producing this volume, and to the Hibbert Trustees for making it available so cheaply.

MANSFIELD. THOMAS WOOD.

SUPPLEMENT AU DICTIONNAIRE DE LA BIBLE. Fascicules XXII, *Jésus Christ—Judaïsme;* XXIII, *Judaïsme—Justice et Justification.* By Pirot and Robert. Paris: Letouzey and Ané.

This supplement, which is the work of French and Belgian Roman Catholic scholars, has reached the end of a fourth volume with the letter J, and promises to be on completion a new dictionary in itself. It already displays a wealth of theological learning, insight, and devotion, which Anglicans may envy. The weight of its scholarship may be estimated by the article on Judaism which extends to seventy-five double-columned quarto pages, and its breadth by the often massive bibliographies containing exhaustive references to works and periodicals, Anglican and Protestant (often thus distinguished) as well as Roman Catholic, which, particularly in the case of continental authorities, are remarkably up to date. For obvious reasons the work of English authors later than 1938 is less familiar. An interesting feature in a Bible Dictionary is the provision of articles on Biblical *scholars—e.g.*, that on Jülicher, which is fair-minded but discriminating. To many Anglicans there will seem to be a surprising freedom in the conclusions reached in a book bearing an *imprimatur*, particularly in regard to Old Testament subjects such as the book of Jonah. The work, when completed, is likely to be a contribution to French theological literature of considerable importance, which Anglican students, "put off" by the intransigence of much English Romanism, would find not only instructive but refreshing.

ST KATHARINE'S COLLEGE, LIVERPOOL. G. E. P. COX.

THE BIRTH OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. A translation of Alfred Loisy's *La Naissance du Christianisme*, by L. P. Jacks, with a Preface by Gilbert Murray. Allen and Unwin. 18s.

It was Loisy's contention that a strictly scientific analysis of the New Testament reduces the established facts about the life and teaching of Jesus, and the history of the Apostolic Church, to a bare minimum: dogmas about the person of Jesus, accounts of miracles performed by Him and His disciples, and the stories of the Birth, Transfiguration, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus, owe their place in the New Testament to the faith of those who, on the basis of the belief of Peter that Jesus had risen from the dead, became members of the primitive Christian Church in the decades which followed the Crucifixion. *La Naissance du Christianisme*, published in 1933, was written in the light of those presuppositions. It was an important book, and both the scholarship as well as the ingenuity of the author are clearly recorded in its pages.

But Loisy's greatest contribution to the study of the New Testament was not the extreme conclusions to which, as critic, he came, nor his ingenuity in arguing for these conclusions, but his demonstration of the impossibility of proving by scientific means the truth or falsehood of the Christian claims; it is perhaps for this reason that his work has been, in the past, so neglected by British biblical critics of the various Liberal schools of thought.

It is a pity, therefore, that eight years after his death the translation of a particular book, in isolation from the rest of his works, should be undertaken in support of a point of view alien to Loisy himself. The preface, written by an avowed agnostic, one who is quite frankly hostile to the Christian claims about Jesus, gives the book a "twist" which only those who have read all the writings of Loisy, or were privileged to know him personally, can expose. At my last talk with him, just before the war in 1939, he expressly stated that he did not wish to deny that Jesus rose from the dead; he intended only to show that the Resurrection of Jesus could neither be proved nor disproved by a critical analysis of the records alone, and he was emphatic in his strictures against scholars who misinterpret him.

L. J. COLLINS.

DAY BY DAY WE MAGNIFY THEE. Compiled and translated by Margarete Steiner and Percy Scott. Epworth Press. 12s. 6d.

This book contains selections from the writings of Luther, arranged as daily meditations according to the Christian Year. Very few of the selected passages have previously appeared in an English translation. There is thus provided here an opportunity of tasting the flavour and of discovering the range of Luther's interpretation of Scripture and of entering into the tradition of Lutheran spirituality. Many will find it a book not merely to be read but to be used for the purpose for which it is intended. Here is one example, from a meditation on Heb. v, 6: "Priest is a strong and lovely word. There is no lovelier or sweeter name on earth. It is much better to

hear that Christ is called 'Priest', than Lord, or any other name. Priesthood is a spiritual power which means no other than that the priest steps forth, and takes all the iniquities of the people upon himself as though they were his very own. He intercedes with God for them and receives from Him the Word with which he can comfort and help the people. It is lovelier and more comforting than 'Father' and 'Mother', for this name brings us everything else."

A Portrait of Michael Roberts. Edited by T. W. Eason and R. Hamilton. Privately printed by, and obtainable from, College of St Mark and St John, Chelsea. N.p.

D. H. Lawrence said that "the world is made up of a mass of people and a few individuals". Michael Roberts was one of the few individuals. As a man and as a thinker he stood out in his generation and, if it had not been for his early death, he would have exercised a steadily increasing influence. As it was, he left some important books behind him which will continue to be read. The readers of his books, as well as his friends, will be grateful for the memoirs collected in this slender volume. Mr T. S. Eliot contributes an introduction, and other chapters describe Michael Roberts as a schoolmaster, as a mountaineer, as a writer, and as Principal of the College of St Mark and St John. They bring the man to life.

The Meeting-Place of God and Man. By Gilbert Hort. S.C.M. Press. 4s. 6d.

A series of Holy Week addresses by a young theologian of very great promise, who died in 1944 soon after he had joined the Cambridge Mission to Delhi. Bishop Barnes contributes a short memoir.

Convocation of Canterbury. What it is; What it does; How it Works. By Arthur F. Smethurst. S.P.C.K. 3s. 9d.

This handbook is intended chiefly for members of the Convocation of Canterbury. It will be very useful to newly elected Proctors, since it contains in concise form the information of which they need to be in possession. For a full history of Convocation it will be necessary to wait for the completion of the study upon which the Rev. E. W. Kemp is engaged.

Catholicism: A Study of Dogma in Relation to the Corporate Destiny of Mankind. By Henri de Lubac, S.J. Burns Oates. 15s.

We warmly welcome an English translation of this well-known and invaluable book. It is quite indispensable for thought about the social implications of Christian belief.

A. R. V.

Intinction and Administration of the Chalice. By T. Grigg-Smith. Grosvenor Press, Portsmouth. 4s.

To an American accustomed to regard intinction as a churchmanship issue, it is odd to find an Englishman with Mr Grigg-Smith's view of the sacrament advocating this method of administration. In America since the last General Convention intinction is legal in any form authorized by the bishop, and is widely used. Several methods are employed, most of them unacceptable to Catholic-minded churchmen. That form of administration advocated by the Canon in this book is the only one with any chance of acceptance by Catholics and is not open to serious objection from the opposite quarter. It consists in placing the wafer, dipped in wine, on the tongue of the communicant. The priest may use a chalice with a special compartment for wafers or carry both chalice and paten in the left hand. The latter is quite feasible, as the reviewer can testify. A third alternative is to have a deacon carry the paten.

Though this method is open to the objection that it does not obey the dominical injunction to "drink", it avoids the grave irreverence of other forms of intinction such as placing the damp wafer in the hand of the communicant or allowing the latter to dip for himself when he is offered the chalice.

Doubtless the author is right in saying that in this age of hygiene it is wrong to force persons who have been educated to regard the common drinking-cup as insanitary to communicate in the usual manner. There doubtless is some small danger of infection in spite of the antiseptic properties of alcohol and in spite of the distasteful precaution of wiping the lip of the chalice with a cloth. Nor does the argument that the clergy as a group are notoriously good actuarial risks quiet the minds of those who fear the common chalice. Some provision should be made for such people, but it should not be of a sort to offend the ideas of reverence of another large group in the Church. Mr Grigg-Smith's method is a good solution if it is not allowed to be an opening wedge for the diversities of administration with which America is cursed.

In conclusion the reviewer would like to record his disagreement with the author on one point. Mr Grigg-Smith insists that where the method is used the priest ought to communicate in the same way as the people. This is surely wrong. In the Anglican Communion the normal way of receiving should be from the chalice itself, and it should never be refused to those who want it. To safeguard this principle it seems best that the priest should always communicate in the normal way.

Robert B. Pegram.

General Theological Seminary,
New York City.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: Gerald Kennedy, *The Lion and the Lamb* ($2.50); Edward T. Ramsdell, *The Christian Perspective* ($2.50); J. F. Newton, *Everyday Religion* ($1.25).

CHATERSON: Oliffe Richmond, *The Farther View* (A poem) (5s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: George Seaver, *Nicolas Berdyaev* (6s.).

EOS VERLAG: Thomas Ohm, O.S.B., *Das Christentum im Neuen Indien* (n.p.).

EVANGELISCHES VERLAGSWERK (STUTTGART): Wilhelm Stählin, *Vom Wagnis der Predigt* (2.40 DM.).

FABER AND FABER: R. H. Barrow, *Introduction to St Augustine, The City of God* (30s.); Gerald Heard, *Is God Evident?* (12s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: E. L. Allen, *Christianity and Society; Christian Humanism; The Self and its Hazards; Jesus our Leader; Creation and Grace; The Sovereignty of God and the Word of God; Freedom in God* (2s. each).

HUTCHINSON: T. G. Jalland, *The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church* (7s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: A. J. Gossip, *In the Secret Place of the Most High* (5s.).

LATIMER HOUSE: Arthur W. Hopkinson (Ed.), *The Pocket William Law* (6s.).

LONGMANS: Gavin Ardley, *Aquinas and Kant* (18s.); A. S. T. Fisher, *An Anthology of Prayers* (3s. 6d.).

LUNDEQUISTIKA BOKHANDELN (UPPSALA): Gösta Hök, *Herrnhutisk Teologi i Svensk Gestalt* (Kr. 8.50).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. H. Rowley, *The Biblical Doctrine of Election* (14s.); Hans Lietzmann, *From Constantine to Julian* (21s.).

J. C. B. MOHR (TÜBINGEN): H. J. Schoeps, *Aus Frühchristlicher Zeit* (n.p.).

MOWBRAY: James Wareham, *The Conducting of Retreats* (5s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. Hensley Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life, Vol. III* (25s.); G. W. Briggs, *A Shorter Service Book* (2s. 6d.).

PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED PUBLISHING CO.: B. B. Warfield, *The Person and Work of Christ* ($4.50).

S.C.M. PRESS: H. G. G. Herklots, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Henry Hogarth, *Henri Bremond* (13s. 6d.); Norman Sykes, *Daniel Ernst Jablonski and the Church of England* (2s.); A. C. Bouquet, *Karl Marx and his Doctrines* (1s.); Christopher le Fleming, *The Use of Music in Religious Drama* (1s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (2s. 6d.); N. B. Stonehouse, *The Areopagus Address* (2s.).

UNIVERSITÉ DE LOUVAIN: Alb. van den Daele, S.J., *Indices Pseudo-Dionysiani* (n.p.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG (ZURICH): F. Blanke, M. Huber, W. Kägi and H. Kraemer (Eds.), *Das Menschenbild im Lichte des Evangeliums* (13.50 fr.); Oscar Cullmann, *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst* (Second edition, improved and enlarged; first published 1944) (7.80 fr.); Werner Bieder, *Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi* (12 fr.).

Note.—Any readers of THEOLOGY who would be willing to send their copies, after they have read them, to a missionary overseas are asked to communicate with the Hon. Secretary for Overseas Literature, S.P.G., 15, Tufton Street, Westminster, London, S.W.1.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher